

1997-98 SESSION
COMMITTEE HEARING
RECORDS

Committee Name:

Joint Committee on
Finance (JC-Fi)

Sample:

Record of Comm. Proceedings ... RCP

- 05hrAC-EdR_RCP_pt01a
- 05hrAC-EdR_RCP_pt01b
- 05hrAC-EdR_RCP_pt02

➤ Appointments ... Appt

➤ **

➤ Clearinghouse Rules ... CRule

➤ **

➤ Committee Hearings ... CH

➤ **

➤ Committee Reports ... CR

➤ **

➤ Executive Sessions ... ES

➤ **

➤ Hearing Records ... HR

➤ **

➤ Miscellaneous ... Misc

➤ 97hrJC-Fi_Misc_pt127_LFB

➤ Record of Comm. Proceedings ... RCP

➤ **

Wisconsin Technical College System

(LFB Budget Summary Document: Page 621)

LFB Summary Items for Which Issue Papers Have Been Prepared

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
2	General Aids for Technical College Districts (Paper #945)
3	Faculty Development Grants (Paper #946)
8	Contracts for Youth Apprenticeship Instruction (Paper #947)
-	Minor Policy and Technical Changes -- Position Authority (Paper #948)

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

General Aids for Technical College Districts (WTCS)

[LFB Summary: Page 657, #2]

CURRENT LAW

In 1996-97, \$110,199,200 GPR is provided for state general aids for technical college districts. The funds are distributed through a formula which takes into account each of the 16 district's costs, FTE students and equalized property valuation.

GOVERNOR

Increase state general aids for technical college districts to \$111,301,200 GPR in 1997-98 and \$112,414,200 GPR in 1998-99. The additional funding of \$1,102,000 in 1997-98 and \$2,215,000 in 1998-99 would represent annual increases of 1.0%.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. The following table shows the amounts appropriated for general aids to WTCS districts and the ratio of general aid to aidable costs since 1990-91. Aidable costs represent expenditures, including debt service, associated with providing postsecondary, vocational-adult and college parallel programs which are funded by property tax and state general aids.

<u>Year</u>	<u>General Aid</u>	<u>% Change</u>	<u>Aidable Cost</u>	<u>% Change</u>	<u>Ratio of Aid to Cost</u>	<u>Change in CPI**</u>
1990-91	\$92,534,500	--	\$319,076,800	--	29.0%	5.4%
1991-92	96,034,500	3.8%	336,660,200	5.5%	28.5	4.2
1992-93	99,034,500	3.1	357,849,100	6.3	27.7	3.0
1993-94	104,454,200	5.5	376,344,800	5.2	27.8	3.0
1994-95	110,199,200	5.5	403,685,400	7.3	27.3	2.6
1995-96	110,199,200	0.0	432,274,500	7.1	25.5	2.8
1996-97*	110,199,200	0.0	457,303,800	5.8	24.1	3.0

*Based on April 1997 estimates.

**Consumer Price Index changes for calendar years 1990 through 1996.

2. As the table indicates, the state's share of district aidable cost has declined from 29% to an estimated 24.1% in 1996-97. However, the increase in aidable costs has exceeded the rate of inflation, as measured by the Consumer Price Index, in each year during this period.

3. In its agency budget request, the State Board requested increases in general aids of \$4,959,000 in 1997-98 and \$10,141,100 in 1998-99, which would represent increases of 4.5% annually. The Board indicated that this level of funding would be required to maintain the current level of programming and stability in property tax levies.

During public hearings on the budget, representatives of the Technical College System have indicated a desire for a 2.5% increase in general aid in each year if the original 4.5% request is not funded.

4. The Board indicates that one of the factors contributing to its request is the cost increase in WTCS employe contract settlements, which range from 3% to 5.75% in 1996-97. The Board also cites, as a reason for increased district costs, greater numbers of students with disabilities and expanded programs and services in the areas of school-to-work, distance education and other educational technology activities such as the implementation of electronic applications for admission. However, statewide FTE enrollment in 1995-96 declined by 9.4% since its peak in 1992-93.

5. In the 1995-97 biennium, no increases were provided for general aids or categorical aids to WTCS districts. However, total WTCS revenues increased by 3.7% in 1995-96 and an estimated 4.8% in 1996-97, largely due to property tax revenue increases of 6.7% and 5.8%, respectively.

6. Under current law, WTCS district levies for all purposes except debt service cannot exceed 1.5 mills. For districts at the mill limit, increases in revenue are essentially limited to increases in their equalized property values, and thus it is argued that particularly for these districts, there is a greater need for state aid. This issue, however, was a greater concern in the early 1990s, when more than half of the districts were at the mill limit. In 1996-97, only

four districts are at the mill limit. Rapid growth in equalized property valuations in recent years has allowed most districts to increase their property tax revenues while remaining at or below the limit. In 1996, the statewide average increase in property valuations was 7.6%, ranging from 3.4% at Milwaukee to 15.3% at Nicolet.

7. Due to changes in district aidable costs and equalized valuations per FTE, increases in general aids are not distributed uniformly to all districts. Current projections for 1997-98 indicate that the estimated percentage change in general aid for individual districts would range from -2.9% to 6.4%. Of the three districts which show a decline in general aid in 1997-98, one (Milwaukee) is currently at the 1.5 mill limit. However, these estimates are based on projections of district property valuations, costs and FTEs and should be considered speculative; actual payments may differ significantly from such preliminary estimates.

8. The focus of the state's property tax relief efforts in recent years has centered on elementary and secondary school aids. The state's other major local aid programs have been frozen while the Governor and Legislature have appropriated funds to reach the 66.7% K-12 commitment.

Specifically, no increase has been provided since 1995 for the following programs: shared revenue, expenditure restraint, county mandate relief and payments for municipal services. No increase in these programs is recommended in SB 77 for 1997-99. The small municipalities shared revenue program (SCIP) was funded at \$14 million in 1995 and reduced to \$10 million in 1996. It would stay at that level for the next two years under SB 77. In addition, transportation aids for 1998 and 1999 would, under SB 77, remain at their 1997 level. To provide a comparable 1% annual increase for these programs would require approximately \$10.6 million GPR and \$5.9 million SEG in the 1997-99 biennium. Finally, biennial funding for community aids under the Governor's bill is \$15.5 million less than the current base funding.

Given the fact that these other major local aid programs are, at best, frozen under the Governor's bill, one could question the provision of a \$3.3 million increase for Technical College districts.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to provide an additional \$1,102,000 GPR in 1997-98 and \$2,215,000 GPR in 1998-99 (an increase of 1% annually) for state general aids to WTCS districts.

2. Increase general aids to WTCS districts by one of the following percentages.

% Increase	Funding Amount Calculated as a Change to Base			Funding Amount Calculated as a Change to Governor		
	1997-98	1998-99	Total	1997-98	1998-99	Total
0.5%	\$551,000	\$1,104,800	\$1,655,800	-\$551,000	-\$1,110,200	-\$1,661,200
1.5	1,653,000	3,330,800	4,983,800	551,000	1,115,800	1,666,800
2.0	2,204,000	4,452,100	6,656,100	1,102,000	2,237,100	3,339,100
2.5	2,755,000	5,578,900	8,333,900	1,653,000	3,363,900	5,016,900
3.0	3,306,000	6,711,200	10,017,200	2,204,000	4,496,200	6,700,200
3.5	3,857,000	7,849,000	11,706,000	2,755,000	5,634,000	8,389,000
4.0	4,408,000	8,992,300	13,400,300	3,306,000	6,777,300	10,083,300
4.5	4,959,000	10,141,100	15,100,100	3,857,000	7,926,100	11,783,100

3. Provide a 1% increase only in 1997-98, by reducing funding in the bill by \$1,113,000 GPR in 1998-99.

Alternative 3	GPR
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$1,113,000

4. Delay providing a 1% increase until the second year of the biennium, by reducing funding in the bill by \$1,102,000 GPR in 1997-98 and \$1,113,000 GPR in 1998-99, which would provide an increase to the base of \$1,102,000 GPR in 1998-99.

Alternative 4	GPR
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$2,215,000

5. Delete the Governor's recommendation.

Alternative 5	GPR
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$3,317,000

Prepared by: Merry Larsen

MO# *11442 1.5% increase*

JENSEN	Y	N	A	BURKE	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A	DECKER	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A	GEORGE	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A	JAUCH	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A	WINEKE	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A	SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A	COWLES	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A	PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE *10* NO *5* ABS *1*

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

Faculty Development Grants (WTCS)

[LFB Summary: Page 658, #3]

CURRENT LAW

No provision.

GOVERNOR

Provide \$832,000 GPR annually in a new, annual appropriation for grants to be awarded by the WTCS Board to district boards to establish faculty development programs. Require that such faculty development programs promote: (a) instructor awareness of, and expertise in, a wide variety of newly emerging technologies; (b) the integration of learning technologies in curriculum and instruction; and (c) the use of instructional methods that involve emerging technologies. Require the WTCS Board to promulgate rules to implement and administer the grants, including rules establishing criteria for awarding the grants. Provide that expenditures of grant amounts under this provision would not be included in the technical college district's aidable costs for the purposes of calculating state aid payments to the technical college district.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. Currently, the only state-funded faculty development program for WTCS instructors is the instructor occupational competency grant program, under which grants are provided to WTCS districts to pay the salaries of instructors who update their skills through temporary work experiences in business in their field of instruction. A 50% local match is

required. In 1996-97, \$71,300 GPR is budgeted for the program which serves approximately 90 instructors annually. The program is intended to improve an instructor's knowledge of, and skills in current industry practices and does not focus on instructional technology.

2. The faculty development grants proposed in the bill were included in the WTCS Board's 1997-99 budget request. According to WTCS staff, each of the 16 WTCS districts would receive a grant to partially fund the establishment of a teaching innovation center. Staff at the centers would formulate and implement faculty development activities in the three "core" areas required in the bill:

- *Instructor awareness of, and expertise in, newly emerging technologies.* The centers would offer workshops, either at the campus or district level and/or through videocourses and the Internet, to familiarize instructors with the use of technologies such as teleconferencing, the Internet, multimedia and hypertext courseware, videocourse production and computer-based curriculum development, instruction and assessment.

- *Integration of learning technologies in curriculum and instruction.* Staff at the centers would assist instructors in using technology to design and develop curricula and course materials and for course delivery.

- *Use of instructional methods that involve emerging technologies.* WTCS students have varying experience with the use of technology when they enroll in technical college courses. The centers would provide workshops or on-line courses or videocourses to assist instructors in acquainting students with telecommunications technologies such as e-mail, the Internet and computer-aided instruction. Instructors would also receive assistance in selecting instructional delivery methods appropriate to the learning styles of their students and using remote assessment techniques for students taught through distance education or other nontraditional means.

3. The bill does not specify whether the grants would be distributed to the districts on a competitive or noncompetitive basis. However, WTCS Board staff indicate that each district would receive an equal "base allocation" of approximately \$30,000 to \$40,000 per district to ensure that a minimum level of services are provided at each teaching innovation center. It is anticipated that most districts would use these funds to hire a director or coordinator for their center. Districts could request additional funding to cover costs associated with serving a greater than average number of faculty members or for special projects which could be shared among districts.

4. In 1995-96, WTCS districts spent over \$27 million on computer technology and distance education systems. While all districts provide some activities for faculty improvement in the use of technology, these activities vary among districts and data on expenditures for these purposes is not available. Of the 16 districts, 14 have technology labs at which faculty can receive assistance in such areas as using hardware and software and learning to use distance education equipment.

5. Three WTCS districts (Waukesha, Fox Valley and Milwaukee) currently operate teaching innovation centers similar to those which would be established under the bill. Of the three, Waukesha's center is the most advanced and therefore, would be used as a model for centers in the other districts. Waukesha's center, which is open 37 hours per week, has had 600 visits by faculty and staff and has offered more than 30 workshops since it opened in August of 1996. Staffing for the center consists of a full-time director, two 0.25 FTE faculty members, and three non-teaching faculty who each spend approximately four hours per week at the center. For 1996-97, the total expenditures are estimated at \$174,600. This includes \$132,400 in staff costs for the salary of the director and release time for faculty, and \$42,200 for equipment and operating expenses. The faculty union has contributed approximately \$4,000 with the remainder of the funds provided by the district.

6. The WTCS Board staff indicate that districts need to intensify their efforts in the area of faculty technology training due to increasing demand by employers for employees with knowledge of telecommunications and other types of technologies. In addition, staff believe that the integration of technology into the curriculum as well as its use in communications and course delivery, can improve student learning.

7. Unlike K-12 teachers, most WTCS faculty come from business and industry, rather than schools of education. As such, most WTCS faculty development activities focus on improving teaching skills in general rather than on instructional technology. While the grants are not intended to cover the entire cost of establishing a center, the Board argues that the proposed program would provide an incentive to districts to increase their efforts in technology training and would serve to somewhat equalize the level of services available to faculty statewide, and in turn the quality of education provided to students.

8. One could argue that if the purpose of the grants is to ensure a certain level of programming across districts, the flat grant approach proposed by the Board would be disqualifying since all districts would receive the same amount regardless of their ability to generate revenues from other sources. Further, the districts which are already providing the base level of services desired by the Board would receive the same amount as districts which currently have no specific program for technology training. WTCS staff indicate that while districts in which centers already exist could use a portion of their grant to improve or increase the services they offer, these districts would also be expected to assist other districts in establishing centers.

9. In the past, the WTCS Board has held that faculty development is primarily the responsibility of local districts. Given this view, one could argue that if the districts consider faculty knowledge and use of technology to be a priority, they could allocate state general aids or local revenues to expand activities in this area.

10. Under the bill, the additional funding for the grants would be included in the agency's base budget in the 1999-01 biennium. However, the Committee could provide funding

only to cover start-up costs associated with the establishment of the centers and sunset the appropriation at the end of the 1997-99 biennium, after which the centers would be supported with district funds and general state aids. A less costly option for start-up funding would be to provide \$50,000 per district, for a total of \$800,000 GPR, only in 1997-98.

11. Although no local matching funds would be required under the bill, WTCS has stated that each district would be required to provide matching funds of at least 25% of the grant amount. District contributions, which are expected to exceed 25%, are likely to be in the form of equipment purchases and release time for instructors to help staff the centers and to participate in workshops and other activities conducted by the centers. Since WTCS already intends to require a local match, the Committee could consider a statutory requirement that each district provide matching funds equal to at least 50% of the grant amount, which would be identical to the matching requirement under the current instructor occupational competency grant program.

12. In the WTCS budget request, the Board indicates that after the end of the 1998-99 fiscal year, districts would be required to report to the Board on the results of the activities funded through the grants. It may be reasonable to require that, during the next budget process, the WTCS Board submit a report to the Legislature on the activities in each district funded by the grants and the centers' effectiveness at meeting the statutory purposes of the funding.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to provide \$832,000 GPR annually in a new, annual appropriation for grants to WTCS districts for the establishment of faculty development programs.

2. Modify the Governor's recommendation by one, or more, of the following:
- a. Specify that a district which receives a grant would be required to provide local matching funds equal to at least 50% of the grant amount.
 - b. Provide that the grant program and appropriation would sunset on June 30, 1999.
 - c. Require that the WTCS Board submit a report by March 1, 1999, to the Legislature on the activities in each district funded by the grants and the teaching innovation centers' effectiveness at meeting the statutory purposes of the funding.

3. Delete \$32,000 GPR in 1997-98 and \$832,000 GPR in 1998-99 to provide net funding of \$800,000 in 1997-98 for first year start-up grants.

<u>Alternative 3</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$864,000

4. Delete the Governor's recommendation.

<u>Alternative 4</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$1,664,000

Prepared by: Merry Larsen

MO# AH 2 abc 946

JENSEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
OURADA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
LINTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

BURKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GEORGE	<input type="checkbox"/>	N	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
WINEKE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A
SHIBILSKI	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A
COWLES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

AYE 13 NO 2 ABS 1

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

Contracts for Youth Apprenticeship Instruction (WTCS)

[LFB Summary: Page 659, #8]

CURRENT LAW

As part of the state's educational standards, school districts are required to provide access to an education for employment program approved by the State Superintendent. Beginning in the 1997-98 school year, the program must incorporate youth apprenticeship programs or other job training and work experience, and instruction in skills relating to employment.

Technical College district boards are permitted to enter into contracts to provide educational services to public and private educational institutions, federal and state agencies, local governmental bodies, industries and businesses.

GOVERNOR

Provide that if a WTCS district board contracts with a school board to provide youth apprenticeship instruction to pupils enrolled in the school district, the district board may not charge the school district an amount greater than the school district's average instructional cost per pupil, as determined by the State Superintendent, for each pupil receiving the instruction. This provision would first apply to contracts entered into, modified or renewed on the effective date of the bill.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. The youth apprenticeship program provides high school juniors and seniors with the option of enrolling in a two-year program combining academic coursework with on-the-job training in specific occupational areas. Pupils who complete the program receive an occupational proficiency or skills certificate in addition to their high school diploma. As of the fall of 1996, 1,050 pupils were enrolled in youth apprenticeship programs in a total of 14 occupational areas.
2. In 1996-97, 12 WTCS districts provide instruction to 315 of the youth apprentices in the state. Other youth apprentices receive the classroom component of their apprenticeship at their high schools, at other high schools in the district or at the business where they receive on-the-job training. The WTCS districts providing instruction for youth apprentices do so under contract, generally between the WTCS district and the school board of the district of enrollment. However, one WTCS district contracts with the local Chamber of Commerce and another contracts with the cooperative educational service agency, which in turn, charge the school district. The bill provision would not apply to these WTCS contracts with other entities.
3. Pupils participating in youth apprenticeship programs are counted in the school district's membership for state aid purposes. WTCS districts which provide classroom instruction to youth apprentices do not receive any state funds for this purpose and the youth apprentice FTEs are not considered under the formula used to distribute state general aids to WTCS districts.
4. In most cases, separate WTCS courses are developed specifically for youth apprenticeship programs and enrollment in these courses generally consists only of youth apprentices. Because these courses enroll a small number of students, the per pupil cost of providing such instruction can be quite high, since fixed costs, such as the salary and fringe benefits for the instructor, equipment and classroom space, must be distributed over a small number of students. At least two WTCS districts have been able to enroll some youth apprentices in existing courses which has lowered the cost of the instruction.
5. The portion of a WTCS district's costs recovered under the contracts varies. Some districts, such as those which charge an amount based on tuition and fees, subsidize the costs of the instruction with local and/or federal funds. Districts which charge an amount equal to direct instructional costs plus a portion of indirect expenses usually recover the largest percentage of costs. However, the portion of indirect costs charged to school districts varies from 7.5% to 26% of the total contract amount, while indirect costs represent an average of 67% of direct instruction costs.
6. Staff from the Department of Administration indicate that this provision is intended to provide greater uniformity in the costs of the contracts across school districts. In addition, staff from the Department of Workforce Development indicate that some school districts have found the cost of the contracts prohibitively high and are reluctant to spend more on pupils in youth apprenticeship programs than on pupils in regular academic programs. For this reason, it is

argued, enrollments in WTCS courses is low. However, WTCS Board staff indicate that one of the factors contributing to the relatively high per pupil cost is the small number of pupils enrolled in the courses.

7. The following concerns have been raised regarding the use of a school district's average instructional costs as the basis for determining contract amounts for youth apprenticeship instruction:

- A school district's instructional costs have no relationship to the costs incurred by a WTCS district to provide the instruction. For example, many of the youth apprenticeship programs consist of technical training which involves the use of expensive equipment; expenditures associated with providing and maintaining such equipment would not be included in a school district's costs.

- The proposed language does not take into consideration variances in the cost of instruction for different youth apprenticeship occupational areas.

- School district instructional costs are based on an academic year, whereas WTCS courses, including those taken by youth apprentices, are offered on a semester basis.

- While youth apprentices must be in grades 11 or 12, instructional cost data encompasses all grade levels. Since it is generally assumed that the cost of educating an elementary school student is lower than the cost of educating a high school student, the average instructional cost for K-12 grades would be lower than for high school grades alone.

8. The term "average instructional cost" is not defined in the bill. One option would be to use the definition relating to interdistrict payments approved by the Joint Legislative Council Special Committee on Public School Open Enrollment for its draft legislation. Under this alternative, average cost would be defined as the statewide average per pupil school district cost as determined annually by the Department of Public Instruction, for regular instruction, co-curricular activities, instructional support services and pupil support services for the prior school year. In 1995-96, it is estimated that for all of these cost categories together, the statewide average was \$4,203.

9. The proposal would need to be clarified as to whether "pupil" means a headcount or a full-time equivalent count of students. The number of youth apprentices currently enrolled in an individual WTCS course varies from two to 42 and the estimated number of FTE youth apprentices enrolled in an individual course varies from 0.24 to 8.0. WTCS defines 1.0 FTE as a student enrolled for at least 15 credits per semester, or 30 credits per year. Since most youth apprentices attend WTCS courses for only a few hours per week, they do not represent large numbers of FTEs. For example, while 10 youth apprentices are enrolled in courses at Blackhawk Technical College, these students equal only 1.2 FTE student.

10. The effect of the proposal would vary depending on whether a headcount or FTE approach would be taken. While current contract amounts range from \$178 to \$6,150 based on headcounts, these amounts range from \$913 to \$22,969 when calculated on a FTE basis. As an example, 14 youth apprentices are enrolled in an auto technician course at Fox Valley Technical College. The total amount charged to the school district, which is based on direct cost of instruction plus 7.5% for indirect costs, is \$49,452, or \$3,532 per pupil. However, because the 14 pupils equal only 5.97 FTEs, the cost per FTE is \$8,283. Under the bill, assuming that the school district's average instructional cost is approximately \$4,200 per pupil, the amount the WTCS district would be allowed to charge, on a per pupil basis, would be slightly greater than the current charge. However, if the charge to the school district is based on FTEs, the WTCS district would not be permitted to charge more than \$25,074, which is approximately half of the current contract amount.

11. The potential impact of the proposal on the youth apprentice program is unclear. If WTCS districts continue to provide these contractual services, it is possible that school districts would incur lower costs. However, since WTCS districts are not required to provide instruction for youth apprentices, a WTCS district may choose not to enter into a contract if the proposed maximum payment is not sufficient to cover a certain percentage of the WTCS district's costs. In this case, the school district would have to provide the instruction itself or discontinue its youth apprenticeship program, which could result in fewer pupils being able to participate in youth apprenticeships.

12. It is likely that WTCS districts which are prevented from recovering their costs by the proposed provision would have to fund the remaining costs through the property tax or general aids in order to continue to provide youth apprenticeship instruction. One could argue that since youth apprentices are not the primary customers of the technical college system, WTCS districts should not be required to subsidize the cost of instruction for these pupils at the expense of other students and programs.

13. A less restrictive alternative would be to limit the contract amount to the WTCS district's direct instructional costs associated with providing the instruction; WTCS districts would be prohibited from recovering indirect costs.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation.
2. Modify the Governor's recommendation by adopting one or more of the following:
 - a. Specify that the limit on the amount charged to the school district would be calculated on a per semester, rather than an annual basis.

b. Specify that the limit on the amount charged to a school district would be calculated using the headcount of the youth apprentices receiving instruction.

c. Specify that the limit on the amount charged to a school district would be calculated using the full-time equivalent (FTE) number of the youth apprentices receiving instruction.

d. Specify that the limit on contract costs would be based on the statewide average per pupil school district cost as determined annually by the Department of Public Instruction, for regular instruction, co-curricular activities, instructional support services and pupil support services for the prior school year.

③ Modify the Governor's recommendation by specifying that a WTCS district board may not charge the school district an amount greater than the WTCS district's direct instructional costs associated with providing the youth apprenticeship instruction.

4. Delete the Governor's recommendation.

Prepared by: Merry Larsen

MO#

AK*3*947

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE

NO

ABS

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

Minor Policy and Technical Changes -- Position Authority (WTCS)

GOVERNOR

No Provision.

MODIFICATION TO BILL

Adjust the WTCS Board's position authorization by -3.0 GPR positions and 1.0 FED position annually.

Explanation: The 1995-97 state budget act reduced the Board's budget by \$230,700 GPR in 1995-96 and \$302,300 GPR in 1996-97 and provided that the allocation of these reductions be determined by the agency. In making the required reductions, the Board eliminated 2.0 GPR positions and transferred funding for 2.0 additional positions from 50% GPR/50% FED to 100% FED. While these adjustments were made in the state's position management information system (PMIS), they are not reflected in the budget forms. This modification would align the agency's position authorization with the PMIS.

<u>Modification</u>	<u>GPR</u>	<u>FED</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
1998-99 POSITIONS (Change to Bill)	-3.00	1.00	- 2.00

Prepared by: Merry Larsen

MO# Modification

JENSEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
OURADA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
LINTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

BURKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GEORGE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
WINEKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COWLES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

AYE 15 NO 0 ABS

to #948

PAPER #948

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM

Transitional Services for Handicapped Students

Motion:

Move to increase funding for grants to technical college districts for transitional services for handicapped students by \$200,000 GPR annually and direct the WTCS Board to distribute the additional funds to those districts which do not currently receive transitional services grants.

Note:

In 1996-97, \$200,000 GPR is appropriated for grants to WTCS districts to provide handicapped students with a coordinated set of services intended to ease the transition from high school, or the community, to postsecondary programs or other vocational training. Such services include: recruitment; individualized program planning; interpersonal and study skills; enrollment assistance; coordination of services between the secondary school, WTCS district and other service providers; and job placement and post-employment skills. Currently, grants of \$25,000 each are awarded to eight of the 16 WTCS districts. Districts are required to provide a 25% local match.

Under the bill, funding for this program would remain at the 1996-97 base level. This motion would increase the amount appropriated for transitional services grants from \$200,000 GPR to \$400,000 GPR annually and direct that the additional funds be awarded to the districts which do not currently receive these grants (Blackhawk, Lakeshore, Nicolet, Northcentral, Northeast, Southwest, Western and Indianhead).

[Change to Bill: \$400,000 GPR]

VOTE OVER →

MO#

485

JENSEN
OURADA
HARSDORF
ALBERS
GARD
KAUFERT
LINTON
COGGS

Y	N	A
Y	N	A
Y	N	A
Y	N	A
Y	N	A
Y	N	A
Y	N	A
Y	N	A

BURKE
DECKER
GEORGE
JAUCH
WINEKE
SHIBILSKI
COWLES
PANZER

Y	N	A
Y	N	A
Y	N	A
Y	N	A
Y	N	A
Y	N	A
Y	N	A
Y	N	A

AYE 9 NO 8 ABS 1

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM

Incentive Grants Program

Motion:

Move to modify the incentive grants program by creating a new category for grants to technical college districts, or consortia of districts, to create or expand vocational and technical programming at secured juvenile correctional facilities. Beginning in 1997-98, allow the WTCS Board to award up to \$150,000 annually under this category.

Note:

In 1996-97, a total of \$7,888,100 GPR is appropriated for the incentive grants program which provides grants to WTCS districts, or consortia of districts, under four categories: (a) basic skills--creation or expansion of adult high school, adult basic education and English as a second language courses; (b) emerging occupations--new and expanding occupational training programs, courses or services, and related staff and instructional material development; (c) educational programs, courses or services that would not otherwise be established or maintained because of limitations in district fiscal capacity; and (d) technology transfer--programs that assist business and industry in adopting and implementing new technology. SB 77 would continue funding at the base level of \$7,888,100 GPR annually in the 1997-99 biennium.

This motion would establish a fifth category under the incentive grants program for grants to technical college districts, or consortia of districts, for the creation or expansion of vocational and technical programs in secured juvenile correctional facilities. In addition, this motion would allow the WTCS Board to award grants totalling up to \$150,000 annually under this category beginning in 1997-98. There are four juvenile correctional facilities currently operating in Wisconsin: (1) Lincoln Hills School, Lincoln County; (2) Ethan Allen School, Waukesha County; (3) Southern Oaks Girls School, Racine County; and (4) Mendota Juvenile Treatment Center, Dane County. Under SB 77, an additional facility in Prairie du Chien (Crawford County) would begin operations in 1998-99 as a secured juvenile correctional facility.

VOTE OVR →

MO# 1510

JENSEN	Y	N	A
1 OURADA	Y	N	A
2 HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 14 NO 1 ABS 1

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM

LFB Summary Items for Which No Issue Papers Have Been Prepared

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
1	Standard Budget Adjustments
4	Basic Skills Grants
5	Budget Reductions
6	Telecommunications Retraining Reestimate
7	Reestimate Federal Indirect Cost Reimbursements
9	Tuition Charges
10	Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act Funds
13	Educational Approval Board Positions
14	Transfer Educational Approval Board to Higher Educational Aids Board

*Panzer wants to be
able to use Fed/B to
do #4.
Burke & Jensen-Dick*

LFB Summary Item to be Addressed in a Subsequent Paper

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
12	School-to-Work Programs

LFB Summary Item for Introduction as Separate Legislation

Item #	Title
11	Technical Preparation Programs